

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,207	01/16/2007	Vladimir Krapka	1033590-000002	9232
21839 7590 01/15/2008 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC		•	EXAMINER	
POST OFFICE	E BOX 1404	,	BRITTAIN, JAMES R	
ALEXANDRI	A, VA 22313-1404		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			3677	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/15/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com debra.hawkins@bipc.com

	·				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/565,207	KRAPKA, VLADIMIR		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		James R. Brittain	3677		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE.	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133)		
Status					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 Ja	anuary 2006.			
		action is non-final.			
3)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E				
Dispositi	ion of Claims				
4)	Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the application.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.			
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
	Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.				
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.			
	ion Papers	·			
	•				
	The specification is objected to by the Examiner		the butter Function		
10)[The drawing(s) filed on <u>20 January 2006</u> is/are:				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	= 1 1	• •		
11)[]	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex				
	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119	armier. Note the attached office	raction of form 1 10-102.		
	•	priority under 25 H C O C 4401) (d) on (f)		
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(a) or (t).		
a)	1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received			
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		ion No		
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori				
	application from the International Bureau		30 III tilis National Stage		
* S	see the attached detailed Office action for a list of		ed.		
			· - ·		
Attachment	t(s)				
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)		
2) 🔲 Notice	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Di	ate		
3) 🔀 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>01162007; 01202006</u> .	5) Notice of Informal F	atent Application		
rapei	140(3)/Wall Date <u>01102007; 01202006</u> .	6)			

Application/Control Number:

10/565,207 Art Unit: 3677

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petzl (US 5432984) in view of Anderson (US 5438734).

Petzel (figures 1, 2) teaches buckle structure for safety straps comprising an upper frame 14 and a lower frame 12 of different sizes with each having a first long side for being connected to a fixed strap loop 29 and a second long side for being connected to a second strap 16. The difference is that a lateral side of the upper frame lacks a gap for passage of a strap. However, Anderson (figures 1, 2) teaches providing gaps 26 in the lateral sides of the buckle for ease of release so that unthreading a strap is not needed (col. 1, line 58 - col. 2, line 12), a distinct advantage. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the buckle of Petzel so that a lateral side of the upper frame has a gap in view of Anderson teaching it to be desirable to do so. As to claim 5, Anderson teaches that it is desirable to provide the upper frame with a middle transversal part 16 so as to aid in maintaining the first strap.

Claims 2, 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petzl (US 5432984) in view of Anderson (US 5438734) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Reiter (US 1997653).

. 💸

Further modification of the buckle of Petzl so that the lower frame is bent at a sharp angle away from the plane of the upper frame would have been obvious in view of Reiter (figure 2) providing a portion 23 of the lower frame at a sharp angle away from the plane of the upper frame so as to aid in gripping the second strap. In regard to claim 6, it would have been obvious to use a sleeve to secure the frames of the device of Petzl in view of Reiter suggesting the use of integral sleeve 16 to secure the frames together.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petzl (US 5432984) in view of Anderson (US 5438734) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Banks (US 4670945).

Further modification of the buckle of Petzl such that the width of the upper frame is wider than the width of the lower frame would have been obvious in view of Banks (figures 1-5) teaching such a relationship to be desirable for ease of lifting the upper frame.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James R. Brittain whose telephone number is (571) 272-7065. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 5:30-2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, J. Gay can be reached on (571) 272-7029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3677

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/James R. Brittain/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3677

JRB